EVEL
ONE

THE OBERLIN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

MARCH 1947

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
(510) 649-2500
LIBRARY
1962

BR
1
024
Mar 1947
GTU
Storage

OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
OBERLIN, OHIO
VOL. IV, NO. 2

OBERLIN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Volume IV MARCH, 1947 Number 2

EDITORIAL STAFF

HOLLIS S. PISTOLE, *Editor*

W. Edwards, F. Hutchings, J. Redinger, P. Uhlinger

Thomas W. Graham, D.D., *Dean*

Clarence H. Hamilton, Ph.D., *Faculty Advisor*

Victor T. Fujiu, *President of the Seminary Union*

Table of Contents

PASTOR NIEMOELLER VISITS OBERLIN - - - - - - - - 2

THE DEAN'S PAGE - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 3
Thomas W. Graham

THE CONCEPT OF REVELATION IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL - - 4
James C. Trimble

THE SERVANT OF YAHWEH POEMS IN ISAIAH - - - - - - 17
E. Loleta Wood

THEOLOGY IN THE PARISH - - - - - - - - - - - 25
Glenn A. Hall

BOOK REVIEWS - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 29

The Oberlin Theological Review is published by the students of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio, three times a year. Subscription price: $1.00 per year.

Pastor Niemoeller Visits Oberlin

A significant honor was bestowed upon Oberlin when Pastor Martin Niemoeller spoke before a capacity crowd in Finney Chapel on February 3. Pastor Niemoeller, who is touring the United States by invitation of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ and the American branch of the World Council of Churches, appeared in Oberlin through the efforts of Dr. Walter Horton who invited him on behalf of the churches of Oberlin, Elyria, and Lorain.

The former Nazi prisoner spoke with firmness and in surprisingly good English which he learned while in confinement. He still bears the marks of the long years spent in Nazi concentration camps . . . a tired and frail body.

The German Pastor, who has been criticized from pulpit and press in this country, told his audience here that he had been worried about the reaction of a visit from a German minister, but that he had received nothing but kindness and sympathy since his arrival in this country. He expressed his appreciation at being greeted as a brother by former enemies.

The Pastor told the crowd gathered in Finney Chapel that Nazi persecution had caused a revival of Christianity in Germany. He related his personal history of the time spent in Nazi concentration camps. His reward for his imprisonment came on Christmas Eve, 1944 while in Dachau when he was asked to preach a Christmas sermon to six non-Germans, all of different creeds. This experience Pastor Niemoeller considers as the glorious triumph of his persecution, when he came together with those who were suffering because of his nation's aggression, in a bond of spiritual fellowship that went beyond state, creed, and individual differences.

Following his address in Finney Chapel, a question period was held at the First Church. In answer to written questions, Rev. Mr. Niemoeller declared that the position of a warlike Germany is overstressed and there can be no possibility of war in Europe under present conditions.

"The East and West must live in peace," he said. "Central Europe must become either a bridge or a battlefield between these two ways of life. Germany cannot adopt either way of life exclusively, it must be the bridge between."

The Dean's Page

Dear Friends:

I am writing this "message" as the second semester opens. I find myself a man of mixed moods.

I am distressed by the intellectual confusion of our day and the evident bewilderment of many who should be the leaders of Christian thought.

I am disturbed by the appalling wastage of effort in the churches. We ministers have let ourselves and our members become so engrossed in the mechanics of "programs" that we are slighting the main task—the bringing of men face to face with Jesus Christ, the only true Saviour of mankind. The time is short, but there is yet time to save the world from destruction, if we set the churches at their central business.

On the other hand I am encouraged. There is a serious tone to our day. Men are giving more thought to fundamentals, recognizing the greater resources and power which they have at their command. They seem more ready for the sustained and sacrificial effort by which this century can be made "the greatest of them all." There is a wistful gleam in their eyes. If we do our part, it will become a glint of purpose and a light of victory.

"The dawn comes but once to waken men." Pray God we be not tardy.

Yours faithfully,

Thomas Wesley Graham

The Concept of Revelation in the Fourth Gospel

James C. Trimble

Revelation may be defined as God's disclosure or manifestation of himself and his will to man through an act or acts within history. Theologians distinguish between two types of revelation: general and special. Man, by observing the orderly processes of nature, gains a general revelation of God. But this general revelation is insufficient; it fails to meet the religious needs. Special revelation is where God breaks into history and discloses himself. He does not necessarily set aside the laws of nature in this thrust into history, rather he uses the laws of nature for his purposes. The concept of revelation in John's gospel would fall into the latter category —revelation is what God discloses.* God makes himself known by sending his Son, Jesus of Nazareth, who was with God before the foundation of the world. His function while in the world was to disclose or reveal the Father. Because the Son existed with the Father in "heaven," because his function during the incarnation was to reveal the Father, and because he retained his divine glory during the incarnation, he will be called the Heavenly Revealer in this paper. The thesis of this paper is stated in the prologue, "Nobody has ever seen God, but God has been unfolded by the Divine One, the only Son, who lies upon the Father's breast."[1] The Revelation is the person of the Revealer.

I. The Relation of the Father to the Revealer

In what sense is the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel related to God? To be the Heavenly Revealer, he must be allied with God. Did God send the historic Jesus? This is the problem of Christian theology. If God had nothing to do with the mission and message of Jesus, if Jesus is nothing but the good man, moral and pure, if the historic Christologies are nothing but the invention of man, then Christian theology is of all subjects most worthless and demonic. And some have thought it such. Our author does not share this skepticism. He firmly believes that Jesus is God's Revealer. What, therefore, is the relationship between God and the Heavenly Revealer?

---

*John does not deny general revelation but his emphasis is on special cp. 1:9.

[1]Moffatt's trans. of 1:18.

1. As shown by *apostello,* and *pempo*: Before the Revealer was sent by the living Father, John the Baptist was first sent to prepare the way of the Revealer. "There was a man sent from God whose name was John." John testified that he was sent before the Revealer or the Christ. Again, John quotes Isaiah to show his function to the Revealer, "Make straight the way of the Lord." The Father consecrated and sent the Revealer into the world. Jesus testifies that the living Father sent him. Again and again a speech of Jesus contains the participial form of *pempo, kai o pempsas me Patar.* There was no doubt in John's mind that God sent the Revealer. And the God who sent Jesus is *alathinos.* John does not define true for us except to say that it is the only true God who sent the Revealer. No more definition was necessary because the God of Jesus was also the God of the Old Testament. And monotheism was not questioned in post-exilic Judaism. The contrast which is made in the prologue bears out this conclusion, "the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ."

2. As shown by *agapao* and *phileo:* John uses these terms reciprocally. The Father both *philei* and *agapa* the Son. The Father did not begin to love his Revealer at his baptism or at his birth. John pushes the loving relationship beyond history. Jesus prays, "for thou loved me before the foundation of the world." And the Father continues to love the Son during the incarnation. The Father loves the Son and shows him all which he does. Finally, the Father loves the Revealer because he is faithful in work which he does.

3. As shown by *didomi:* The Revealer may have existed in loving fellowship with the Father before the foundation of the world, but that does not mean that the Revealer is autonomous or acts independently of the Father. There are statements in the prologue such as "all things were made through him," (and *kai theos an o logos*), which, if divorced from the rest of the gospel, might be interpreted to mean that the Revealer was a second God. The passages, however, (in which the Revealer is the object of *didomi*) prove conclusively that he is dependent upon God. The Father, who has life in himself, gives life to the Son, gives the commandment which the Son speaks, gives the Son the works which prove that he is greater than John the Baptist, gives all judgment to the Son, and gives the Son his disciples. After Peter had cut off Malchus' ear, Jesus asked Peter, "Put up the sword into the sheath: the cup which the Father has given me, shall I not drink?" The passion was the consummation of the revelation which the Father gave to his Revealer.

4. As shown by *doxadzo* and *doxa:* It is God who glorifies the Revealer. He never glorifies himself. "If," he confesses, "I glorify myself my glory is nothing, it is the Father who glorifies me." He prays that he might

glorify the name of the Father and receives a response, "I have glorified you and I will again glorify you." The Revealer uses the passive form (*doxastha*) except when he prays to the Father or when he acknowledges that the Father has glorified him (*ina doxastha o vios tou theou di autos; doxason son ton uion; and ekeinos eme doxasei.*) Never does the Revealer glorify himself. John's use of *doxadzo* is added proof of the subordination of the Revealer to the Father. John does not give too much content to *doxadzo;* it is like *alathinos* in this respect. Thayer defines it: "to cause the dignity and worth of some person or thing to become manifest and acknowledged." God, therefore, glorified his Revealer to make manifest the dignity and worth of his person. In the very process in which the Revealer is glorified, he glorifies the Father. In other words, the God of Jesus has a purpose for man, who, not knowing this purpose, God sends his Heavenly Revealer to make his purpose clear. If the Heavenly Revealer makes this purpose clear, and it can only be made clear through his death, then man can see the purpose of God and thus the worth of God is made manifest and the man accepts it. In order for a Revealer to make manifest the purpose of the Father, he must be a Heavenly Revealer, one who is capable of reflecting the glory of the Father. And so on the lips of Jesus are placed the following words, "I desire that they also whom thou has given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou has given me: for thou loved me before the foundation of the world." Just how the Heavenly Revealer could become man, John does not say. He merely declares, "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." He is positive that the Father sent him and that the Revealer was faithful in his task. Those who have followed in the Christian tradition, even to the present, seek a solution of the problem which John raises.

5. As shown by *martureo*: The Father not only sent, loved and glorified his Revealer, he continued to bear witness that Jesus was his Revealer during the incarnation. Not true is my witness, if I bear it of myself, declares the Revealer, there is another who bears witness concerning me. The *erga* which the Revealer performs demonstrates that the Father bears witness concerning him. The Revealer, can bear witness concerning himself because the Father bears witness concerning him. Lastly, even if the Revealer testifies concerning himself, his testimony is true because he is persuaded that he comes from and returns to the Father.

6. Miscellaneous passages that show the relation of the Father to the Revealer: The Father teaches the Son. "What I heard from my Father, I have made known unto you." The filial relationship between the Father and the Revealer is shown, "I know that thou hearest me always." It is true that the Revealer works within history to bring about the purposes of the

Father, but in the last analysis it is the Father who acts, "no man can come to me except the Father that sent me draw him." The father is united with the Revealer in judging.

The relationship between the Father and the Revealer is summarized by John, "For he whom God hath sent speaks the words of God . . . The Father loves the Son, and has given all things into his hand." God glorifies his Revealer so that all may know that Jesus is his ultimate revelation. The Revealer shares the ethical purpose of God and he is the reflection, the most complete unfolding of the Father. And lastly, the God of the Fourth Gospel is one who acts in history to bring about his purposes, true, he works through a Revealer; but it is his Revealer.

II. The Relation of the Revealer to the Father

Under the first head the problem was the relationship from God down to the Son. This division has to do with the response of the Revealer to the Father. What did the Revealer's work have to do with the revelation of the living God? John in his prologue states succinctly the task of the Revealer.

1. The filial relationship of the Revealer to the Father; The Revealer is the *omonogenas uios.* The logos conception of the prologue does not reappear in the rest of the gospel; it seems clear, however, that the logos idea i.e., pre-existence is the underlying assumption in the following passage, "he who comes from heaven is far above all others." The Revealer declares in another place that he is from above and that his opponents are from below. Only the Revealer has seen the Father. He finds the source of his life in the Father. Just as God loves his Son, so does the Son love the Father. In all things the Revealer honors the Father. The Son knows the Father. Because of the filial relation with the Father, the Revealer knew all that was to happen. When the Jews marvelled at the teaching of the Revealer, he replied that his teaching was not his but of the one who sent him. The prayers attributed to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel are more like a monologue than the heart rending prayer of Gethsemane, but he does pray, thus acknowledging his filial relationship to the Father.

2. There is unity of purpose between the Revealer and the Father. It is the Father's word which the Son declares to the believers. The Father knows the Son. The Revealer is made to say, "I am not alone, because the Father is with me." Still again, the works of the Revealer prove that the Father is in him. On two occasions the Revealer affirms that he and the Father are one. And this oneness has been interpreted in Trinitarian ideas. Macgregor replies, not so, "The unity here claimed is ethical rather than metaphysical, a unity of will rather than of essence and personality, a mystical unity implying two separate personalities." Even the prologue rejects

any metaphysical oneness, *outos an en archa pros ton theon.* The author of Hebrews approaches the thought of John when he makes the Revealer to be the "effulgence of his glory and the impress of his substance." To be the reflection of the Father is not to be the Father. The prayer of chapter seventeen illustrates the mystical unity, "that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, are in me, and I in thee, they also may be in us."

3. *Ab'eautou* and *ap'emautou* as showing the Revealer's relation to the Father: Moffatt translates both phrases the same: of his own accord, and on his own authority, and *ap'emautou* is translated once "on my own initiative." Whenever the Revealer refers to the work of the Father which he does, he uses not of my own accord. Whenever *ap'emautou* or *ab'eautou* refer to the possible self-initiating act of the Revealer, they are translated, "on his own authority." Jesus replies to the Jews, "But I have not come on my own initiative, I am sent, and sent by Him who is real." At first sight 10:18 appears to be a contradiction of this analysis because the Revealer lays down his life of his own accord. He can do it of his own accord because it is the Father's commandment.

4. The Revealer as continuing the work of the Father: Now and then we get more than an impression that the God of the Fourth Gospel is one who works in history, "My father works even until now, and I work." The law was through Moses but God brought grace and truth through his Revealer. He does the works of the Father. Not condemnation, but salvation is his main purpose. "My food is to do the will of him who sent me." He comes in the name of the Father. He speaks what he hears from the Father. The Father is at one with him in judging. In the last analysis it is the Father who draws believers; the Revealer takes care of them. It is not foreign to John's thought to say that Jesus brought to white hot heat the work the Father does eternally.

5. The Revealer's destiny after the incarnation: The logos made flesh is the Heavenly Revealer who before the foundation of the world was loved and glorified by the Father. After finishing his task he returned to the Father. "I came out from the Father, and . . . I leave the world, and go unto the Father."

John summarizes the relation of the Revealer to the Father, "For I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me," and "nobody has ever seen God, but God has been unfolded by the divine One, the only Son, who lies upon the Father's breast."

III. The Self-Consciousness of the Revealer

One result of a study of the synoptic gospels is: the conscious activity of Jesus can be known only in part, if at all. Books have been written on the purpose of Jesus, but not one has found wide and continued acceptance.

What is almost impossible from the standpoint of the historian, is an imperative for the theologian. John felt this need. He, therefore, "portrayed the exalted Lord of the church projected back into the life of Jesus."

1. Self-consciousness as shown by *uios anthropou:* It usually means, in the synoptics, the eschatological figure who brings in the Kingdom of God. E. F. Scott rightly maintains that *uios anthropou* has lost its eschatological orientation in the Fourth Gospel; but he wrongly assumes that the Son of Man merely denotes the human nature of Jesus. The term is a synonym for the Heavenly Revealer. Jesus says to Nathanael, "You shall see the heavens opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." In terms of Jacob's dream he was conscious that he was the ladder between heaven and earth. It is the Son of Man who descended out of heaven. The Father gave Jesus authority to execute judgment because he is a Son of Man.* The Son of Man gives the bread of life. The Son of Man has to be lifted up so that his work can be completed and he can return to the Father. When Judas goes out, Jesus says, "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God shall be glorified in him." To say that *uios anthropou* has the primary meaning of Heavenly Revealer is not to reject the humanity of Jesus, "the word became flesh"; but during the incarnation the Revealer retained the glory which he had from the foundation of the world.**

2. Self-consciousness as shown by *Christos:* John uses this term infrequently. Others declare the Revealer to be the Christ. The woman at the well tells Jesus that when the Christ comes he will declare all things. He replies, "I am the one speaking to you." Jesus is made to pray, "that they should know . . . him whom thou didst send even Jesus Christ." In three places either the Jews or the crowd ask Jesus if he is the Christ. He replies: "you know whence I come; the works testify concerning me; and it is necessary for the Son of Man to be lifted up." The Revealer uses *Christos* infrequently. When he did it referred to his function as Revealer —"he will tell us all things, and the one whom thou did send."

3. Self-consciousness as shown by *ego eimi:* In at least six passages *ego eimi* has no predicate nominative. Those outside the eighth chapter will be dealt with first. Jesus came walking to the disciples on the troubled sea and said, *ego eimi,* "be not afraid." During the supper he tells his followers what is to happen so that they might believe *ego eimi.* Jesus tells

*Macgregor sees in the omission of ὁ stress on the humanity of Jesus; the humanity makes him a fitting agent of God's judgment. It is not the Revealer's humanity that makes him the agent of judgment as much as it is his correspondence of purpose and glory with the Father.

**John never resolves this paradox.

the temple police, *ego eimi.* It could be argued that each of these *ego eimi's* could be translated, It is I. And they could be; but should not be, because of the pronounced effects they elicit. In the first instance, they were immediately at the place where they were going. In the second, the Revealer was troubled in spirit because one of his disciples was to betray him. In the third, the soldiers fell to the ground. Only the Heavenly Revealer declaring *ego eimi* could elicit such responses. The use of *ego eimi* in the eighth chapter supports this conclusion. Jesus declared to the Jews that he was going away; that they would not be able to find him; that he was from above; that they were from below; and that they would die in their sin, if they did not believe *ego eimi.* In verse twenty-eight Jesus says, whenever you see the Son of Man lifted up, then you will know *ego eimi.* In reply to the Jews' question that he was not yet fifty years old Jesus declares, *Abraam genesthai ego eimi.* These passages are a declaration, echoing Exodus 3:14 and Isaiah 43:10, that Jesus is a divine Revealer who had the glory of the Father before the foundation of the world and who still retains the divine glory during the incarnation. All which John affirms about the Revealer is brought to a dramatic finale in *ego eimi,* his pre-existence, his mystical unity with the Father, his glory, etc.

4. Self-consciousness as shown by metaphors: The Revealer is the living bread from heaven of which if everyone eats will never hunger again. He is the shepherd and all who came before him are robbers and thieves. He is the resurrection and the life. He is the light of the world. He is the way, the truth, and the life. Lastly, he is the true vine. In none of these passages, is he likened to light, bread, or a vine. He is the light, the bread, the vine—the light, because he alone illuminates the Father; the bread, because he is God's revelation which nourishes man; the vine, because apart from him man cannot be sustained in the Father. The metaphorical passages, therefore, throw into bold relief the Heavenly Messenger's function of revealing; they are vehicles of revelation.

5. Self-consciousness as shown by climactic declarations of Jesus: The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel knew that he was the divine Revealer. He retains his pre-existent glory while on earth. He never acts on human motivation. He knew what he was going to do before hand. There is no development of the messianic consciousness. He is recognized as the Christ from the first chapter. After the Greeks asked to see the Revealer, he prayed, "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour." He answers Pilate, "To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." And the end for which he came into the world is: whenever you see the Son of Man lifted up—the

Revealer was conscious from the very beginning that his work of revealing the Father could be completed on the cross.*

IV. The Relation of the Revealer to the Believers

This division will deal with the relationship of the Revealer down to the believer. The next will treat the reverse relationship. It should be noted that John does not use *apokalupto* except in an Old Testament quotation.

1. The relationship as shown by *gnoridzo:* This word occurs two times, and its meaning is to make known: "All which I have heard from my Father I have made known to you," and "I have made known to them your name, and I will make it known." *Gnoridzo,* therefore, means to unfold the meaning of God to believers.

2. The relationship as shown by *deiknumi:* The Jews asked to be shown a sign, be given a demonstration. When they were about to stone Jesus, he said to them, "many good works have I shown you from the Father." The miracles or signs which he performed demonstrated that he was from God. *Deikumi* was the force of demonstration in 20:20. After Philip asked to be shown the way to the Father, Jesus replied, "do you not know? The one who has seen me has seen the Father; how do you say show us the Father?" Here *deiknumi* does not mean merely to make a demonstration by doing a great work; the Revealer is the demonstration of the way to the Father.

3. The relationship as shown by *phaneroo:* John the Baptist conceived his function to be that of making known the Revealer. His brothers asked him to publicize himself by going to Jerusalem. The signs the Revealer performed made evident his glory. The man was born blind so that the work of God could be made known—provide a springboard for the Revealer's declaration, "I am the light of the world." Chapter seventeen contains the clearest statement of the Revealer's relation to believers as shown by *phaneroo.*

4. The relationship as shown by *emphanidzo:* The Revealer, in the upper room, confides, *kai emphanisoauto emauton.* Judas does not understand how Jesus can manifest himself and again Jesus makes the relationship future *kai prosauton eleusometha kai monan pai auto poiasometha.* This passage says there will be a continuous revelation after the Revealer is glorified. How is this to be accomplished? John never identifies the Spirit with Christ. The most probable interpretation is the Revealer will come to the believers after the incarnation in the sense that he and the Spirit

*There is not a well developed theory of the atonement in this gospel. The lamb of 1:29 probably refers to the scape goat of the Old Testament. The lifting up of Jesus goes back to the rod of Moses.

share a common purpose. The Spirit will continue the work of the Revealer.

5. As shown by *sameion* and *ergon:* John the Baptist did no signs. Jesus' miracle at Cana was the beginning of signs and the manifestations of his glory. The Jews asked for a sign, a demonstration that he was what he claimed to be. The *sameion ergon* are demonstrations that he was sent by the Father. The signs have a deeper significance—they point to the Revealer not merely as the one who opens closed eyes but as the light of the world; not as the one who merely feeds five thousand but as the bread of life. The Revealer never interprets an *ergon* symbolically. Except for two passages, he uses *ergon* in the plural; it has the combined effect of all of his demonstrations. Works and signs are proofs that he is from the Father, many times the signs have a symbolic meaning.

6. As shown by *aioniosdzoa:* John does not retain the primitive division between this age and the age to come. There are a few hangovers from the more primitive eschatology. His Christ, unlike the synoptic Jesus, is a preacher of realized eschatology. "He that hears my word, and believes him that sent me, has eternal life, and comes not into judgment, but has passed out of death into life." Eternal life is a present possession to those who accept the Revealer. John 10:10 is probably the best known passage, *ego althou ina dzoa echosin.* John's purpose in writing the gospel is "that believing you might have eternal life."

7. A concluding word on the Revealer's relationship to people: He knows the motives of people. Being the divine Revealer sets him apart from humanity. This is in marked contrast to the Jesus of the synoptics who mingled freely with publicans and sinners. He never acts on human entreaty. The word became flesh, but he retained his sovereign will. His opponents are powerless until his hour arrives. He carries his own cross.

In his earthly ministry, the Revealer unfolded the meaning of God by doing works and signs and by interpreting the signs in a deeper significance. He gave eternal life to those who believed him. In his relations with people, he always remained as one apart. After he was glorified he breathed the spirit upon his disciples.

V. The Relation of Believers to the Revealer

1. As shown by *pisteuo:* This verb occurs no less than seventy-five times. The noun form *pistis* never *pisteuo* takes a variety of dative and accusative objects. This variety does not change the verbs meaning. To believe is to accept the claims of the Revealer that he was sent from the Father and that he unfolds the Father. The disciples believe because of the manifestation of his glory. Others believed because of his signs. One who believes Moses should believe him of whom Moses wrote. If one is

unable to accept the person of the Revealer he ought to believe the works as divine demonstrations. Many believed because of the raising of Lazarus. Prediction is also a basis of believing. Thomas could not believe except he see, but the usual experience of believers in the Christian community is to believe without seeing. The basis of belief in the synoptics is the miracles and the ethical teaching of Jesus. But the basis in John's Gospel is the person of the Revealer, ethical teaching recedes into the background and miracles become demonstrations of the pre-existent glory of the Revealer.

2. As shown by *ginosko:* This is another of John's favorite words, being used about fifty-eight times. It does not mean just intellectual assent, or that the Revealer's claims are probably true. If one *ginoskei to auto,* then he is fully convinced that the Revealer is what he claims to be, one sent from God. It is not an esoteric *gnosis;* it is capable of being put to a pragmatic test, "anyone who chooses to do his will, shall understand whether my teaching comes from God or whether I am talking on my own authority." The disciples did not understand the significance of all which the Revealer did during the incarnation, but later, through the eyes of faith, they came to know. The Revealer prays, "these know that thou didst send me."

3. As shown by *logos:* The Johannine equivalent of *karugma* is *logos,* except for the technical use in the prologue, and when it means a saying or word in the English sense as in John 4:50. "He that hears my word, and believes him that sent me, has eternal life." To obtain the *logos* of the Father, it is necessary to believe the one whom he sent. The disciple is true who remains in the Revealer's word. If anyone loves the Revealer, he will keep his word. Finally, others will believe through the *logos,* the teaching of the disciples concerning the Revealer.

4. General relationships of the believer to the Revealer: Believers should love and honor the Son, as the Father. Anyone who has learned of the Father, comes to the Revealer. "If any man serve me, let him follow me." The disciples shall do even greater works because the Revealer goes to the Father. There is a mystical unity of the faithful followers and the Revealer. Believers live in eternal life the moment they believe. When the Revealer returns to the Father, they may ask what they will. There is both determinism and universal love: no one can come to the Revealer, except the Father call him, and God so loved the world. Just as the Revealer was persecuted and crucified, so will the disciples be persecuted. And lastly, they are *apostellei* by the Revealer to continue the witnessing to the *logos.*

5. The testimony of others concerning the Revealer: John the Baptist is no longer an eschatological preacher of the Kingdom; he bears witness concerning the Revealer. The early community bears testimony, "we speak

that which we know, and bear witness of that which we have seen;" Nathanael testifies, "You are the Son of God": Peter, speaking for the discipls, affirms, "we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God." Thomas finally declares, "My Lord and my God." The Samaritan woman confesses to her friends that she has found one who told all which she ever did.

Hoskyns sees what John thought the relation of the Revealer to the believer and vice versa to be, "the author has so presented the 'sensible' history of Jesus that his readers are confronted in that history, and precisely there, with what is beyond time and beyond visible occurrence with the veritable Word of God and with the veritable life of eternity."

VI. The Relation of Non-Believers to the Revealer

1. As shown by *krisis:* John believes in realized eschatology—eternal life is a present possession of the faithful, and realized judgment of non-believers. John departs from the tradition of II Corinthians 5:10, though traces of this concept are in John 5:29. Whenever men are confronted with the *logos,* the person of the Revealer, they enter judgment. In Hoskyns' phrase, they are confronted by the "veritable Word of God." *Auta de estin a krisis, oti tophos elaluthen eis ton kosmon, kai agapason oi anthropoi mallon to skotos a tophos.* All *krisis* is given to the Revealer. He has authority to give *krisis.*

2. As shown by *krino:* The primary purpose of the Revealer is not *krino* but *sodzo.* Men are automatically judged when they reject the saving function. "He that does not believe has been judged already, because he has not believed on the name of the only Son of God." The Revealer does not judge on his own authority, his judging corresponds to that of the Father. The Revealer goes so far as to say that he does not judge; he hastens to add, however, that the *logos* which he speaks shall judge. The *logos* should be interpreted as the teaching concerning his person. Therefore, as men face the Revealer, they are judged: the believers go into eternal life and the rebellious remain in the *orga tou Theou.* If you do not believe *ego eimi,* you will die in your sins.

VII. The Spirit as the Continuing Agent of Revelation

The final question to be considered, therefore, is: Did God cease acting and revealing himself within history after the Revealer was glorified? Contemporary theologians answer this question by the doctrine of the Trinity: God the Father created the world; God reconciles the world in Christ; and God continues the work of redemption by his Holy Spirit. This Trinitarian solution would have appeared strange to John, but he would heartily agree that the *pneuma,* i.e., the *paraklatos* continues the work begun by the Revealer.

There is an initial difficulty in the Johannine teaching concerning the *pneuma.* The Revealer confides to his followers that he and the Father will come and make their abode with them. Again the Revealer encourages his disciples by promising, *erchomia pros umas.* In contrast to these passages the Revealer says, "If I do not go away, the *paraklatos* will not be sent to you." The Revealer claims that he will both come and send the *paraklatos.* Paul identifies Christ with *pneuma,* but John does not. It was suggested earlier that this unity can be accounted for by the correspondence of the purpose of the Revealer and the *paraklatos.* Just as John makes the Father and the Revealer one by insisting on a mystical unity of purpose, so does he insist on a unity of the Spirit and the Revealer.

The function of the *pneuma* or *paraklatos,* for they are used interchangeably by John, is to continue the work of the Revealer. He shall glorify the Revealer, and make manifest the worth of his person. He shall bear witness of the Revealer. The Spirit of truth will be with them forever, and will guide them into all truth. "And when he comes, he will convict the world, convincing men of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they do not believe in me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father and you see me no more; of judgment, because the Prince of this world has been judged." The Spirit thus continuing the work of the Revealer makes for a progressive concept of revelation; but with one provision, the Spirit is not independent of the historic revelation of the Revealer, his function is to glorify the Revealer who embodied in his person the Revelation of God.

The object of this article has been to show that for John, Jesus was the pre-existent Revealer who unfolded God to man. John interpreted the historic Jesus in terms of the Christ of faith. He also insisted the word became flesh. Jesus, Heavenly Revealer, retained during his incarnation the glory which was his before the foundation of the world. The evidence of this paper points to one conclusion—the person of the Heavenly Revealer is the Revelation of the Fourth Gospel. To accept him is to have *dzoa aionion.* To reject him is to enter into *krisis.* When men are confronted by the Revealer, they meet the Revelation of God. The law came through Moses, but grace and truth through Jesus Christ. And the *pneuma* continues to confront man with the person of the Revealer. "Nobody has ever seen God, but God has been unfolded by the Divine One, the only Son, who lies upon the Father's breast."

Professor Horton To Go To Europe

Professor Walter M. Horton of the Graduate School of Theology will be returning to Europe again this year under the auspices of the World Council of Churches. He will be attached to the Study Department of the World Council of Churches and will be teaching in the Ecumenical Institute.

In addition to his duties with the Study Department, Dr. Horton has been requested to teach a course to Youth Leaders who will be gathered near Geneva in preliminary preparations for their later world-wide meeting in Oslo. The theme of this course for the young people is "Great Bible Topics."

Professor Horton expects to make his departure at the end of April.

Seminary Guest Register

Dr. C. C. McCown, from the Pacific School of Religion, on the Haskell Lectureship, gave three lectures on *"Jesus in the Twentieth Century."*

Dr. Theodore McCown, son of C. C. McCown, was on the campus the same week as his father on the Mead-Swing Foundation.

Mrs. F. T. Meacham, Missionary to Mount Salinda, Southern Rhodesia, spoke on the subject, *"Some Problems of East Africa."*

Dr. Elbert M. Conover, Interdomination Bureau of Church Architecture, showed colored slides and gave a lecture on *"Church Architecture."*

Dr. John Scotford, Editor of *Advance,* spoke to the church administration class on *"Church Publicity."*

The Rt. Rev. Quentin K. Y. Huang, D.D., Bishop of Kumming, China (Episcopal), gave an interesting account of post-war Christianity in China.

The Servant of Yahweh Poems in Isaiah

AN INTERPRETATION

E. Loleta Wood

It was only sixty years ago that a German scholar, Duhm, first singled out the four passages in Isaiah which are now called The Suffering Servant Songs or The Servant of Yahweh Poems. These four passages are commonly accepted as the following: xlii.1-4, xlix.1-6, 1.4-9, lii.13-liii.12. Many questions have been raised with regard to these four poems and a variety of interpretation has been offered.

When Duhm singled out the portions he assigned them to a different author, and an earlier date, than the rest of Isaiah chapters xl-lv. After further study he changed his conclusion and assigned them to a much later date. He also changed his mind with regard to the identity of the Servant. At first he said that the Servant was Israel but later he decided that the Servant was an individual, a contemporary of the author of the poems. This reversal of opinion on the part of the man who first studied these poems as a unit was but a forerunner of the great divergence of opinion that was to be offered.

Some of the questions which scholars have tried to answer are the following. Were these poems written by the Second Isaiah? Or by someone else earlier or later? If written earlier, were they inserted here by our poet or by a later editor? If they are the work of the Second Isaiah, were they written at an earlier date and inserted here, with or without editing? Are the poems a unit? If so, are they in their original order? I can not hope to set forth the argument and conclusion on all these questions but some will drop from the picture as others are answered. All point to the main problem which is the identity of the Servant. Is the Servant an individual or the nation? If an individual, who? If the nation, is it the ideal nation, the actual nation or the small righteous kernel of the nation? Before attempting to answer any of the above questions, let us see what the role of the Servant is and whether this fits into the message of the rest of the Second Isaiah.

If we read the Servant Songs, as a unit, we find that there is an alternation of voices between Yahweh and the Servant but a development of

thought in spiral ascent until the nations burst forth in the great confession, 'Who could have believed what we heard?' (liii.1)

First Yahweh announces his Servant to whom he has given his spirit and whom he has chosen for a great mission to the nations. 'He shall not flicker or bend, till he establish justice in the earth.' (xlii.4) Then the Servant acknowledges this call from Yahweh, a call which is not a sudden or a new thing for he was being prepared from the beginning. (xlix.2) The Servant feels the great honor that is his and humbly acknowledges that his strength is from Yahweh. (xlix.5) Again Yahweh proclaims the mission of his Servant to all the world. 'So I will make you a light of the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of earth.' (xlix.6b) Again the Servant acknowledges his mission from Yahweh. Although he has been repulsed, has been persecuted, has been scorned, he remains stedfast in his purpose because he had Yahweh beside him. (1.7) And the purposes of Yahweh are not to be thwarted by man's reviling. Yahweh reverses man's judgment in his promise concerning his Servant.

> Lo! my servant shall prosper,
> He shall be exalted, and lifted up, and shall be very high.
> As many were amazed at him—
> So marred was his appearance beyond that of man . . .
>
> ---
>
> So shall he startle many nations,
> On account of him kings shall shut their mouths;
> (lii.13, 14a, 15a)

True to Yahweh's prediction the nations burst forth in amazement:

> He had no form or charm, that we should look upon him.
>
> ---
>
> And like one from whom men hid their faces,
> He was despised, and we esteemed him not.
> Yet it was our sickness that he bore,
> Our pains that he carried;
> While we accounted him stricken,
> Smitten by God and afflicted.
> He was wounded for our transgressions,
>
> ---
>
> And through his stripes we are healed.
> (liii.parts of 2, 3, 4, 5)

And the poem ends with Yahweh's reiterated promise to this Servant. (liii.12).

The impression of the Servant which we receive from the Songs is of a gentle, patient, humble, but none the less a determined messenger (xlii.1-4), confident of the outcome of his mission because he is assured that his call is from God (lxix.1,3). He becomes discouraged, feeling that 'in vain have I labored, idly and for nought have I spent my strength.' (xlix.4a).

But he knows that in reality he has been 'honored in the eyes of the Lord' (xlix.5b) who holds before him the promise, 'So I will make you a light of the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth.' (xlix.6b) Thus keeping close to Yahweh he has learned how to comfort the weary of the world (1.4). But some had not understood the good that they might receive at the Servant's hands; they had abused and reviled him (1.6). Still his confidence is in the One who called him to his task (1.5, 8, 9) And that confidence is justified in the promise of Yahweh that eventually his Servant will be exalted, so exalted that it startle the nations who had abused and reviled him into an acknowledgement of their guilt and his innocence. (liii.6).

These poems give a message of suffering, but not suffering to expiate one's own sin. Rather it is the suffering of the innocent that the redemption of mankind, not just Israel but all the earth, might take place. This message is unique in the religion of the Hebrews, so startlingly different, in fact, that the Jewish nation never could accept it as a role meant for itself. "... the Jews refused to consider themselves the scapegoat for the sins of the Gentiles."[1] Does this message form a part of the message of the Second

"It is true that the Servant Song portions can be lifted from the context without doing violence to the thought. But the Second Isaiah's thoughts are not in orderly sequence in the other portions and leaving in the Songs does not violence to the thought, either. However, if the Songs are removed from the context and made into a unit in the original order, they do show a developing thought, rising to a climax in the confession of the nations. The rhythm is the same in all the Songs and is somewhat different from the rhythm in the immediately preceding and following portions."[2]

The idea of vicarious suffering is found nowhere else. But some of the other ideas in these Songs are the very ideas which the Second Isaiah presents in other places. Israel is to become exalted, xliii, parts of 19, 20, 21; also xli. 15. Israel is chosen by Yahweh and will be upheld by him, xli. 9, 10. Israel's special mission is to be a witness for the Lord, the one God to the nations of the earth, xliii. parts of 9, 10, 11; also xlii.6. The nations will be surprised at the transformation of Israel, xlix.7. This close similarity, between the vision which the Second Isaiah has for the revived Israel and the role of the Servant in the Songs makes it most probable that the Songs, too, were written by the Second Isaiah.

But there is one striking difference between the Songs and the rest of the message, which difference brings to the front the question of the

---

[1]Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 479.
Isaiah?

[2]J. M. P. Smith, The Prophets and Their Times, pp. 228.

identity of the Servant. In proclaiming that Israel's punishment is finished, the poet admits that Israel has sinned (xl.2) He comes back to this point again and again, to let the people understand that not through any merit of their own but through the gracious love of Yahweh have they been forgiven, so that through them Yahweh might be glorified before all people. (xliii.9; also see xliii.25, xliv.22, liv.8) Quite different is the picture given of the Servant.

> He was wounded for *our* transgressions,
> He was crushed for *our* iniquities;
>
> ---
>
> They made his grave with the wicked,
> His tomb with evildoers;
> Although he had done no violence,
> Nor was any deceit in his mouth. (liii. 5a, 9)

It is this contrasting picture of the Servant in the Songs and in other places (for the Second Isaiah does call Israel Servant in other places) which has forced many scholars to the conclusion that the Servant must be a person. Others hold the conviction that the Servant, instead of being Israel, is the ideal Israel or is the righteous kernel of Israel.

By those who consider the Servant an individual many names have been offered. One such name is Jehoiachin who had been taken into captivity at the fall of Jerusalem in 597. He had been imprisoned for thirty-six years, after which he was released and given a position at court with other captured kings. For this the poems would have been written about 560. Zerubbabel is another name offered. He was not born until about 540, so the poems would have had to be much later than the body of the Second Isaiah's work. Neither of these men is of such character that by any stretch of the imagination could he be called a guiltless person bearing the sins of the nation. Another suggestion is Moses. The vision of the Israelites being led into a fruitful and happy land is a parallel to the story of their entrance into the Promised Land. And Moses was an intercessor for Israel. Also it was suggested that perhaps Moses had suffered a violent death and the unknown grave was an attempt to conceal that fact. The above interpretations were offered by Sellin at one time or another. Duhm, who first separated the Servant Songs, thought of Jeremiah as inspiration for the poet who penned the Songs. He thought that contemporary of Jeremiah has written the poem, that it had fallen into the hands of the Second Isaiah after he had begun his work, that he had edited it and inserted portions at various places.

Gressmann and Gunkel, holding that any historical figure is too small for the Servant's role, set forth the idea of a mythical figure as the intent of the poet. One of the strong points in this argument is the idea of a resurrection, which they claim must have been related originally. But since the

resurrection is only implied (and some deny even this) and since in any story of a dying and rising god the the resurrection is a main feature, stressed rather than implied, 'it is unsafe to build a theory on the assumption that a feature now absent was once prominent.'[3]

Mowinckel has suggested that the Second Isaiah himself is the Servant, and this on the basis of the 'I' passages in the Songs. This 'would imply far too extravagant an egotism for us lightly to charge the prophet with it.'[4] Also, in the poem the Servant had died, which would make it difficult to place the Second Isaiah in the role.

This brings us to the suggestion of some indications which point away from the identification of the Servant with any individual figure. The implication of the return to life of a person does not seem probable. 'The resurrection from the grave on the part of a Jew living in the days of the Second Isaiah or before would have been an event of such startling magnitude that it could not merely be taken for granted in 52:13 and 53:12 . . . Since nothing indicates that the author held the doctrine of the resurrection from the grave—a doctrine unknown in the Old Testament before the third century (Is. 26:19; cf. later Dan. 12:2)—the Servant can hardly be conceived as an historical figure.'[5]

But we can not set this aside merely on the ground that it would have been a new idea; the Second Isaiah was not averse to new ideas, rather he seems to have promulgated several. But illness (some critics suggest that the illness was leprosy) was universally accepted as God's punishment for sin. Just as we have seen that the historical figures suggested were too small to fit the role depicted, so it does not seem probable that *any* person, afflicted, crushed, despised, could have gained such a following that after his death a return to life and this glorious future would have been predicted for him. And he would have had to be known beyond his own followers if his return were to stop the mouths of kings and startle the nations into words of contrition and confession.

He grew up like a sapling before us,

He was despised and we esteemed him not.

While we accounted him stricken,
Smitten by God and afflicted.

And the Lord made to light upon him
The guilt of us all. liii. parts of 2, 3, 4, 6.

There remains then the question of identifying the Servant with Israel,

---

[3]A. S. Peake, The Servant of Yahweh, pp. 40.
[4]Ibid, pp. 44.
[5]Pfeiffer, op. cit., pp. 478.

or an ideal Israel, or a portion of Israel. I have mentioned that in other places the Second Isaiah identifies the Servant with Israel.

> Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant,
> Israel, whom I have chosen! xliv. 1
>
> Remember these things, O Jacob,
> Israel, for you are my servant. xliv. 21
>
> For the sake of Jacob my servant,
> And Israel my chosen one, xlv. 4 (also xli. 8ff.)

If the author is the same, as I have suggested that he is we should expect a common meaning for the term. At one point in the Songs the Servant is thus identified. 'He said to me, "you are my servant, Israel, through whom I will show forth my glory."' (xlix.3) But some critics claim that 'Israel' is a gloss and so it can not be used too positively. In the LXX, xlii.1 reads as follows:

> See my servant, Jacob, whom I uphold;
> My chosen one, Israel, in whom I delight.

Rather than being an argument for the collective interpretation, the critics of that interpretation say that it only shows that 'Israel' might have been added in the Hebrew in xlix.3, as it was in the Greek in xlii.2.

In chapter xlix, verses 5 and 6 offer a difficulty because the Servant is going to do something for Israel, and therefore can not be Israel. J. M. P. Smith suggests that a translation which 'employs a usage of Hebrew language, too little recognized, for expressing the equivalent of indirect narration, . . . removes our difficulty without any need of textual change.'[6] The translation referred to is an American Translation. Here it is quite clear that it is Yahweh who is to raise up and restore Israel.

The very personal language used by the Servant and to the Servant is a difficult hurdle for some in identifying the Servant with Israel. But the Second Isaiah personifies Israel (Jacob) throughout his message. As the Servant says, '. . . the Lord, who formed me from the womb to be his servant,' (xlix.5) so the Second Isaiah has Yahweh say, '. . . the Lord, your Maker, who formed you from the womb,' (xliv.2) when he is speaking to Israel. Other instances could be cited, for instance, compare xlii.2, with xliii.2. And in this connection one should be reminded of the prevailing idea among the Hebrews of corporate personality. The nation was the responsible unit.

One objection to identifying the Servant with the Ideal Israel, or with the righteous kernel, is that neither has borne the sufferings for Israel. Israel himself has suffered, through the fall of Jerusalem, through

[6]Smith, op. cit., pp. 230.

the destruction of the temple, by the exile from his homeland. He was, as it were, 'cut off from the land of the living . . . stricken to the death.' (liii.8). And in other places the Second Isaiah makes the exaltation of Israel Yahweh's great act of grace.

> I, I, am he who for my own sake blots out your transgressions,
> And will remember your sins no more. xliii.25.
>
> I have blotted out your transgressions like a mist,
> Your sins like a cloud;
> Return to me for I have redeemed you. xliv. 22. (also see xlviii.9)

Then follows in verse 23 the beautiful little psalm which exclaims over the miracle of Yahweh's grace.

> Sing, O heavens, for the Lord has done it,
> Shout, O depths of the earth;
> Break into singing, O mountains,
> O forest, and every tree in it!
> For the Lord has redeemed Jacob,
> And is revealing his glory in Israel. xliv.23.

Why should our author in the Songs reduce the miracle of that act, delete the grace of God, by envisaging only a righteous kernel that needs no grace?

The innocence of the Servant in the Songs and the guilt of Israel in the other portions does not seem to me an irreconcilable difference. It is the nations which ascribe such absolute innocence to the Servant after they witness the amazing reversal by Yahweh of the world's judgment on the Servant. Except for this eulogy from the nations, the contrast is not too great. It is true that the author gives a more ideal portrait of the Servant in the Songs than in the rest of the book but it can be understood if one stands at the two different points from which the Servant is viewed: the discouraged and disconsolate Israel that needs to be comforted and encouraged, and the Chosen One of Yahweh with a triumphant future before it.

Perhaps this points to an answer to one of our questions: were the Songs written at the same time as the rest of the message and did they from the first form an integral part of it? The different viewpoint makes it easy for us to suggest that the Servant Songs were written as a unit. I implied this in my analysis. Not only written as a unit but also written at that point in his ponderings when for a moment the poet glimpsed the magnitude of the possibilities in the course which his imagination mapped out for his people. I think he must have felt the hand of God guiding his hand as he wrote:

See! my servant Jacob, whom I upheld;
My chosen one Israel, in whom I delight.
I have put my spirit upon him,
He shall bring forth justice to the nations. xlii.1

Then, too, Israel's sins, and the suffering for those sins, is in the past. The future now is the important thing, a future in which the glory of Yahweh will be revealed through the glory of an exalted Israel. But because of Israel's exaltation her suffering would have new meaning for the world. If, because of this, the world would come to know and worship Yahweh, the One and Only, 'the maker of all', Israel's suffering would not have been in vain.

The great vision which the Second Isaiah had for the revived Israel is only made more intensive in the Servant of Yahweh Poems if we there identify the Servant with Israel. The poems fit into the full message of the poet, emphasizing—we might say, completing—his message.

In This Issue

Glenn A. Hall, B.D., '32, author of *Theology in the Parish,* is pastor of the Free Methodist Church in Akron, Ohio.

James C. Trimble, M.A., '45, B.D., '46, who brings us the article on *The Concept of Revelation in the Fourth Gospel,* was assistant instructor in New Testament at Anderson College, Anderson, Indiana last year, and is now pastor of the Church of God in Ulysses, Kansas.

E. Loleta Wood, M.A., '38, B.D., '47, author of the study of *The Servant of Yahweh Poems in Isaiah,* will be returning to India in the Spring to teach Old Testament and Religious Education in the United Theological College of Western India. Last November she was ordained to the ministry of the Congregational Christian Church.

The Book Reviews are by members of the Faculty of Oberlin Graduate School of Theology.

Theology in The Parish

Glenn A. Hall

There was a time when the study of theology was a very popular and worthy endeavor in the minds of people, as evidenced by the fact that many of the institutions of learning were established to prepare and train men for the ministry. The aims of Harvard University in its beginning was "the education of the English and Indian youth in knowledge and godliness, with a view to their entering the Puritan ministry." Oberlin was established in 1833 by Reverend John J. Shipherd and Mr. Philo P. Stewart for this cause—that there might be in these parts an institution "which should produce the maximum of spiritual benefit to a 'perishing world.'" It was a kind of missionary zeal which expressed itself, in days which are gone, to establish institutions of learning whose chief end was the propagation of the gospel. Theology was a popular study, held in high regard.

But our days are different. The study of theology is none too popular and in certain quarters, we find a hostile attitude toward this all important study. The study of theology is all important, for in the final analysis, theology deals with man and his relationship to God. This deals with the significance and worth of human life. What matters all other sciences when human worth is lost. For when the worth of man is lost, it is not too long until men start pounding all their treasures into dust. All that the other sciences have gained is lost when the chief cause of theology is lost, which is the true worth of man and his relationship to a moral God. When theology becomes decadent, or is cast aside as worthless, then the significance of the individual is soon gone also. This gives room for another power to exert and reveal itself, which is the all powerful state which sweeps away by force all that is in opposition to the state. Thus the end of a world without an adequate theology is "ashes to ashes and dust to dust." Therefore ancient and modern history teaches one clear lesson: man must have one supreme source of allegiance—a moral God to whom man sustains the relationship of being morally accountable, or it is not long until man (with all of his knowledge and with all of his sciences) begins to beat his treasures into dust. Two world wars within the memory of one generation, certainly reminds us of this awful truth—how the sciences have developed during the course of these wars. Great progress has been made, but please observe well, that progress has been made to one final end—death and destruction.

Theology has a real place in the world. It must be a theology which is adequate, and which never loses sight of its field, which is the worth of man and the never dying fact of God. A theology which deals with petty details and amuses itself with theological hair-splitting, containing contradictions within itself, debasing man, making him but a puppet on the world's stage, acting as God pulls the strings, ought not to find any place in a rational world. Theology has possessed methods in the past which are comparable to the methods of the alchemist, yet because alchemy was what it was, does not mean that modern chemistry should be discarded. So, theology has not always been what theology ought to have been, but that does not say that we do not need theology. We need it to preserve the very products of science and to guide the world in paths of safety and paths of peace. Here is a science which can do something about preserving our "perishing world." Here is the one science which can give adequate guidance to the group and to the individual.

Theology is an imperative to every minister. Theology furnishes the very frame work for his ministry. The questions of what shall I preach, or what shall I teach, or what shall I endeavor to do, will be answered by our theology. The question ought to be asked: why preach, why teach, why endeavor, if there is not a goal to be gained, or work to be done.

Our theology will answer these pertinent questions, and will furnish guidance in these matters. Imagine what would happen to the patient if the physician was as uncertain as to what he must do to gain the objective that the patient desires, that of health, as some ministers are in ascertaining the need for their parishioners. This may explain more than we want to confess about the church in a modern world, but it is a problem that ought to be faced honestly. Every minister must have his theology, for it is a fact that by preaching our doubts, or the things we do not believe, never made anyone a Christian. Christians are made when the minister preaches what he believes, and believes it with absolute trust, and with a sense of desperation. When one hears a sermon and leaves the church pondering whether or not the minister believes what he has preached, instead of pondering the truth preached, the public ministry of that preacher is sick unto death. The minister who would influence his people must have a theology, and believe it!

The question naturally arises then of what theology should a minister have? Shall it be the theology of Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Finney, Aquinas, or a dozen others that might be mentioned. Here is the antinomy in theology. But this is not strange, for in philosophy we do not find one system only, but many systems. The chemist, physicist,

geologist, and the archaeologist are not always in agreement. However, there are always certain foundational facts upon which all are agreed that are sure and truthworthy, and it is upon these facts that their work is established. So, in theology, there may be more than one theory, yet there are those great foundational truths which every minister must trust and build upon. This theology must always include two foundational facts; namely, the worth of man and the reality of God. All Christian thought agrees at this point. It is reported that Abraham Lincoln said, "I can see how it might be possible for a man to look down upon the earth and be an atheist, but I cannot conceive how he could look up into the heavens and say there is no God." As all Christian people look up toward heaven, there could be no doubt at this point, and our human relationships from our helpless infancy down to the last spoonful of food we have tasted, ought to show us the worth of our fellow men. There is one other fact that Christians can agree upon, and it is the fact of sin. Interpret sin how you will, but none are in the kind of a world we have very long until his life is touched by the fact of sin. Those disregarding this fact are soon caught in the grip of sin, and very often they are seeking some minister for help. Here is where we need a workable theology which will guide us in our efforts.

While it might seem desirable to have one system of theology as certain as the laws of mathematics, as is seen in the Roman church, yet such a system stifles thought and freedom of spiritual life. It can be said in our day that there is sufficient freedom and information available that every minister can have an adequate and workable theology in order to make his work effective.

The inescapable fact which confronts every minister is that he must know what he wants to do if he is ever to get the thing accomplished. If he is like a ship without a rudder, then he will drift aimlessly down through the years until he runs upon some rocky coast where he will shipwreck. We must not only know the problems but we must know what to do with them. If we know the problems but do not know the solution to these problems then the ministry will speak in fainter tones and creeping paralysis will bring on what may be slow, but certain, death. The preacher must be able to speak forth and tell the good news that Jesus Christ is able to help us.

For a minister is to minister to the needs of his parishioners. He must have a theology in order to do the work of a minister of Jesus Christ. This means he must believe that through Jesus Christ, God is able to meet human need. He must believe as implicitly in this truth, as the physician and surgeon believes that certain medicines and the use

of the scalpel will secure the blessings of health for the ill. So sure is the doctor that his method is right that he is willing to risk his professional honor and even the life of the patient in the performance of his work. This is the spirit which has produced in modern medicine and surgery the wonders, yes miracles, we behold. This is the same spirit that was dominate in the New Testament in the first century church.

What heeded the chosen eleven
How the fortunes of life might toss,
As they followed their master to heaven
By the royal way of the cross?

They believed the words of Jesus and acted upon them, and so unusual were the results that they were accused of turning the world upside down. If a minister's chief concern is to keep his world on an even keel, he may keep "all things as they were from the beginning of all creation," only to discover that he has kept the evils too. There are many things in our world where the right side has been down too long, and it should challenge every minister to give his strength in turning the right side up, which means the casting of the wrong out and bring the right in. Every parish will present these needs in a greater or lesser degree, so that the minister must know what needs to be done, and how to do it. And he must believe in the adequacy of the Gospel to do it.

Thus, the theology of the minister becomes basic for all of the work to be done in his parish. It is a fair statement of the case to say that if he does not have a basic theology, then he cannot accomplish what a minister of the Gospel should accomplish in his parish. He may be able to preside at teas, give the benediction at community gatherings, be a fellow, hail well met, at the Rotary Club, play golf well, bet on the dog races, smoke the peace pipe, and give a lecture on the latest novel—but there will be spiritual chaos where he ministers. The weak will become weaker, the strong will become decadent, the smoking flax will smoke no more, and the bruised reed will be broken, and the light will go out and it shall be night. Jesus said, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations," which clearly implies something to be taught and something to be believed. Jesus concluded his ministry by commanding them who would follow Him and be His disciples to go "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Remember, people are influenced by what you believe. Remember, your doubts breeds death; your faith begets life.

Book Reviews

Practical Theology and Human Relations

PROBLEMS IN RELIGION AND LIFE, *Anton T. Boisen,* Abingdon-Cokesbury, 159 pages. $1.50.

Here is a useful manual for pastors—"with outlines for the cooperative study of personal experience in social situations." Dr. Boisen is a leader in the field of training ministers for pastoral counseling. The reader will recall his well known study on the inter-relationship of religious experience and mental disorder, entitled "The Exploration of the Inner World." The purpose of this new book is to provide opportunities for more detailed study for pastors who have been attending ministers' institutes. He says "ministers have flocked to these meetings in increasing numbers, and one can not but be impressed by their eagerness and alertness. But I have felt that a further step is needed instead of so many large gatherings where ministers merely listen to renowned authorities. I should like to see more small groups of these same eager men digging out for themselves." Now this pastors' manual helps the working minister to dig things out for himself. We have here a well laid plan for the study of the community, families in the parish, and the needs of the individual members. It is Dr. Boisen's thesis that if a minister is to understand his people, he must deal with all fields of human experience. In this community he must understand the economic conditions under which his people live, the social organizations through which they find expression, the recreation, health and educational facilities available for them. Then too, the minister should have an understanding of the types of maladjustment which he meets from time to time in his pastoral relationships; the mentally ill, the delinquent, the sexually maladjusted, the alcoholic, and the physically ill. Then there are the general problems that the minister of religion is called upon to deal with and he should avail himself of opportunities to become more effective as a personal counselor.

Here is a useful working tool for every minister's study. There is an excellent bibliography at the end of each chapter enabling the busy pastor to go as far as he wants to in helping himself to become a more effective counselor.

MENTAL ILLNESS: A GUIDE FOR THE FAMILY, *Edith M. Stern,* The Commonwealth Fund, 134 pages, $1.00.

Miss Stern states the purpose of this useful book in her opening paragraphs: "problems engendered by mental illness recently are brought . . . to ministers' studies. Sometimes the sickness is incipient with its disruptive effect on the victim's and his family's lives only beginning to be noticeable; sometimes it is far along, and the guidance of the pastoral counselor must be prompt and practicable. In either case, the clergyman carries a great responsibility. This guide-book is intended to be as helpful to him as to other specialists in human relations, directly informing him about the field into which he must so often step and providing him with a book to which he can refer parishioners."

Miss Stern in collaboration with Dr. Samuel W. Hamilton speaks a language that laymen can understand, telling a confused and bewildered family what they can do with a loved one who is mentally sick. Practical suggestions are made on such subjects as: "A Healthy Attitude Toward Mental Illness," "When Mental Illness Strikes," "Private or Public Hospital?" "Why Hospitalized?" "How to Get the Patient Admitted to a Mental Hospital," "Life in a Mental Hospital," "Letters and Visits to the Hospital," and "When the Patient Comes Home." Sometimes families are fearful to commit a loved one to a mental hospital; Miss Stern and Dr. Hamilton give this wholesome advice: "Do not go upon the premise that for your mentally ill relative to live among other mentally ill men and women is the same as if you lived among them. He is sick and they are sick, and he is better off in their company than in that of the mentally healthy, for they will not overtax his emotional strength . . ."

In the chapter on Permanence of Recovery the author has a work of reassurance to families who are fearful about the future of a loved one, "While many patients well enough to leave mental

hospital still have some aftermath of illness, the numbers of others who become fully and permanently restored to usefulness in the community give the lie to the 'incurability' of mental illness. Not only are such persons as well as they ever were but in many cases better! The insight they have gained during hospitalization makes them more productive, happier, and better able to meet life's problems than before the breakdown."

We are told that mental breakdowns are on the increase in America. An alert pastor who wants to be most helpful to a distressed family dealing with such a problem will surely refer to this guide book.

—LLEWELYN A. OWEN

Biblical Theology

AN OUTLINE OF BIBLICAL HISTORY, *Millar Burroughs,* Westminster Press, 380 pages, $3.50.

This book, which has grown out of a course in Biblical theology given by Professor Burroughs at Yale Divinity School, comes at a strategic time when there is a strong revival of interest in the subject of Biblical theology. Preoccupations with questions of origins and interest in the history of religions has so concerned Biblical scholars that Biblical theology has been neglected. W. F. Albright's, FROM STONE AGE TO CHRISTIANITY (1940), G. E. Wright's, THE CHALLENGE OF ISRAEL'S FAITH (1944), J. C. Rylaarsdam's, REVELATION IN JEWISH WISDOM LITERATURE (1946), and N. H. Snaith's DISTINCTIVE IDEAS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT (1946), are among the more important studies which have issued from this new interest. An excellent summary of these trends in Biblical scholarship may be found in Professor C. T. Craig's article in THE JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE for 1943, "Biblical Theology and the Rise of Historicism."

It is important that this new theological emphasis in Biblical studies should not ignore the results of scientific historical scholarship. While not identical with the history of religion in the Bible, Biblical theology cannot be understood apart from that history. Professor Burroughs defines Biblical theology as follows: "History asks what the religion of the ancient Hebrews was; Biblical theology asks what was God's judgment on that religion and what significance it has for us." Biblical theology is concerned with the theological ideas of the Bible, recognizing that "theology in the sense of a systematic elaboration of doctrine does not exist in the Bible." Despite difference in viewpoints among individuals and in different periods in Hebrew history, there is not merely differentation, for there is also a certain unity and meaning in Hebrew religious culture. One of the tasks of the Biblical theologian is to discern the meaning of the total panorama of the religion of the Hebrews. Professor Burroughs properly considers his book a bridge of the gap that exists between the basic courses in Old and New Testament and the practical courses in homiletics and religious education at the seminary.

We can only suggest here the nature of the contents of this excellent book which Professor Burroughs has given to us. His survey comprehends both the Old and New Testaments, and he discusses the following subjects: Authority and Revelation, God, Christ, the Universe, Man, the People of God, the Divine Requirement, Sin, Judgment and Salvation, the Christian Life, Special Offices and Functions, Public Worship, Christian Service, and Moral and Social Ideals. In a brief concluding chapter the author reviews something of the continuity and unity perceptable in the religion of the Bible, a unity which exists despite the variety and constant change, and despite the fact that there is not a unilinear process, but an unfolding in many directions. There are useful indices, besides profuse footnote references to Biblical passages. The latter will be of great value to the student who wants to make a further study of the subjects being presented.

This is a good book, and it will be an important instrument in the education of theologs and ministers.

—HERBERT GORDON MAY

Religious Education

THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, *Paul H. Vieth,* Bethany Press, 314 pages, $2.50.

For the past two years seven interrelated groups totaling more than sixty persons have been making a "Study of Christian Education" under the auspices of the International Council of Religious Education. A glance at the names of

those who have shared in this study reveals both the high quality of the study and also the diversity of viewpoint which were considered.

One committee explored the "theological and educational foundations" of Christian education. This committee sought to "stimulate a reexamination of convictions in order to face the demands of this hour with a fresh sense of mission and a renewed grip upon what is essential." In doing this the committee examined and reported upon "three main fields; (1) the nature of man viewed both in his essential character and in relation to the special situation of the present time; (2) the faith of the church and problems of its teaching; (3) the fundamental principles of educational procedures, which show how people learn, particularly in their religious development."

A second committee reported on "the local church's program for Christian education" and proposed a program of "fellowship, teaching, organization and integration" in the light of "an experimental attitude."

A third committee examined the "curriculum of Christian education" reviewed the strengths and weaknesses of existing curricular materials, and set forth a proper theory for a "curriculum of Christion education" in the light of "basic needs which must be met" and in the light of the existing agencies of Christian education. From these examinations practical recommendations were made for the curriculum.

A fourth committee reported on the "family in Christian education." This committee clarified the primacy of the home, the relationship of the home and the church school, the impact of secular culture upon the home, and considered present policy and practice and gave a list of recommendations to be followed in developing a program of Christian education in relation to the family.

A fifth committee wrestled with a perennial problem—"leadership for Christian education"—considered both professional and lay workers; and suggested educational principles, opporunities and prospects."

A sixth committee dealt with a "community approach to Christian education," stated a spiritual basis for a community approach, clarified the community as educator and set forth "imperative in interchurch cooperation" and the "educational tasks of the churches working together"; proposed a community organization for Christian education, as well as analyzed informal education in the church and community agencies."

A seventh committee studied the "agencies for promotion and supervision" but gave its major attention to the structure and function of the International Council of Religious Education. This committee brought in definite recommendations for more effective functioning of this integrating agency among the Protestant denominations.

The reports of these seven committees were referred to an executive committee. This committee in turn asked Paul Vieth, who as chairman of the Study of Christian Education, to prepare a volume for "general reading" based upon the data of the respective committees. *The Church and Christian Education* was the result. An opening chapter on "Christian Education—Yesterday and Today" and a final chapter on "Christian Education—Today and Tomorrow" along with Paul Vieth's summaries of the reports of the seven committees comprise the nine chapters of the book.

The Critical reader will want both the separate reports, which may soon be secured from the International Council of Religious Education, and the book. The book of necessity omits much of the material of the reports, but at the same time the book attempts to integrate the diversity of materials in the reports. The reports and the book supplement each other and round out a critical examination of Christian education as it expresses itself today through the International Council of Religious Education.

There is much overlapping both in the reports and in the book, although less in the latter. The varied viewpoints at times weakens the reports and the book, but to achieve a significant consensus among such diverse persons who were on the respective committees is an accomplishment of the first magnitude.

The brevity of the reports and of the book is a decided handicap. Although at various places the words reveal much care of selectivity, the emphases are upon an agreed point of view of the different members of the various committees rather than upon a clarification of a particular point of view. The brevity of the reports and of the book also necessitated "a minimum of facts." An equal number of other Christian leaders might have

explored the same fields and have come out at much different places. This arrival at different places might have been true with more facts, but "facts and reports of experiments in Christian education" would have enriched both the reports and the book. The major emphases were upon finding a position upon which different persons could agree.

The section on "theological and educational foundations" is far reaching. It calls for a re-examination of basic assumptions and states that a "gospel centered" curriculum is needed in Christian education. It also states what is implied in such an education.

The reviewer would like to review each chapter but is content to call especial attention to two chapters, "The Family in Christian Education," and "The Community Approach to Christian Education." The first one of these not only calls attention to a basic field for Christian education, but gives some practical suggestions which have significance for the program in the local church. The second chapter, "The Community Approach to Christian Education," has some of the solid material of the book. Theological positions are tested in community relations. This chapter stands fundamental tests.

The Church and Christian Education is needed by a minister who wants to know what is going on in the field of Christian education. But the book is not only for the minister. It could well be required reading for each member of the Board of Christian Education in the local church. Yes, the reviewer would go farther. Here is a book which can serve as a basis of a profitable series of discussions on Christian education. This is a book which can enrich the meaning of Christian education for today and tomorrow.

THE MODERN PARENT AND THE TEACHING CHURCH, *Wesner Fallaw,* The Macmillan Company, XIV plus 228 pages, $2.50.

This book has three basic foundations; (1) the concrete answers to many questions concerning the interrelationship of the church and the home; (2) the experimental data of a "family centered program" of religious education which was instituted in the Winnetka Community Church, Winnetka, Illinois; (3) the religious educational positions upon which the author builds the "family center curriculum of the church." The author states the "underlying philosophy" in the first chapter of the book, and he seeks to clarify his religious and educational positions throughout the book.

The author believes "that we know more about the strategic importance of the home than we have been able to do about it." Accordingly, he describes and defines the church program of "mutuality of relationship between church and home." His programs requires first that the educational program of the church be clarified. (Not as a church school, not at a P.T.A., not as a "unified church program"). "Unless the church transforms itself into a school of learning in which Christian growth takes place, it cannot go to the home with the authority it needs in order to establish an educational relationship wherein home and church interpenetrate." Then his program requires that the church have the leadership and the techniques to interpret its religious function. The author has no place for overlapping of services among community agencies, but he believes firmly that the church has a distinctive function to perform and seeks to interpret and to implement the function.

Since the author exposes many facets of his philosophy it is certain that most of his readers will find some points of disagreement. His attacks upon "liberalism" and his insistence upon a "liberal program" for a church opens him to counter attacks. Likewise his defense of "indoctrination" and his insistence upon "free inquiry" call for more explanation.

But the questions about the book are minor when viewed against the significant contribution which the author has made. This book points the way for future education work in the church. It recognizes the family for what it is—"the personality developing and the cultural and community growing unit." In the family religious education has a "natural setting and here the church is called upon to foster a religious program.

In the area of family-church relationship there will be many books in the future. May those which come later be as constructive and as helpful as this. This book provides an educational basis for a solid church program.

—L. A. STIDLEY

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall.